

Quasilocal energy for tensor V in small regions

Lau Loi So

Abstract

Within a quasilocal small sphere, we find the Bel-Robinson tensor B and recently proposed V have the same gravitational energy-momentum values. One may doubt that whether $\{B, V\}$ are identical? However, we claim $\{B, V\}$ are distinguishable because we find they have different values, in particular, we use pseudotensor to evaluate the energy in other small regions such as ellipsoid. In addition, as a double check, we find $\{B, V\}$ have different number of independent components. Finally, we discover the completely traceless property of $\{B, V\}$ implies the conservation of 4-momentum in small region, and vice versa.

1 Introduction

In attempts to identify a good physical expression for the local distribution of gravitational energy-momentum there have been many different approaches which are similar to Einstein's. For example, those of Landau-Lifshitz, Bergmann-Thomson, Papapetrou and Weinberg. Most of them deal with the Einstein field equation $G_{\mu\nu} = \kappa T_{\mu\nu}$, where $\kappa := 8\pi G/c^4$, $G_{\mu\nu}$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ are the Einstein and stress tensors respectively. One can define a superpotential with a suitable anti-symmetry $U_\alpha{}^{\mu\nu} \equiv U_\alpha^{[\mu\nu]}$ and remove a divergence of $U_\alpha{}^{\mu\nu}$ from $G_{\mu\nu}$ to define the energy-momentum density

$$2\kappa t_\alpha{}^\mu := \partial_\nu U_\alpha{}^{[\mu\nu]} - 2\sqrt{-g} G_\alpha{}^\mu. \quad (1)$$

Using the Einstein equation, we have a total energy-momentum density which satisfies

$$\partial_\nu U_\alpha{}^{[\mu\nu]} = 2\kappa \mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\mu = 2\kappa (T_\alpha{}^\mu + t_\alpha{}^\mu), \quad (2)$$

and hence, due to antisymmetry of $U_\alpha{}^{[\mu\nu]}$, is automatically conserved. Note that $T_\alpha{}^\mu$ is a tensor, $t_\alpha{}^\mu$ is a pseudotensor which does not transform like a tensor under an arbitrary coordinate transformation.

The proposed criteria for testing quasilocal expressions included: (i) limit to good weak field values (i.e., linearized gravity). (ii) good asymptotic values both at spatial and null infinity. We here emphasize that the criteria for these two are not so restrictive; they actually only test the quasilocal expression to linear order. (iii) positivity (i.e., globally) is a strong test but is not easy, (iv) small region: inside of matter the quasilocal energy-momentum expression should, by the equivalence principle, reduce to the material source terms. Most classical pseudotensors pass this test. (v) small region vacuum: positivity for the first non-vanishing parts of the quasilocal expression depend on the gravitational field non-linearly and hence this can give a discriminating test of the expression, it is quite non-trivial but not impossibly difficult.

Positive energy should hold not only globally but also quasilocally on any scale. However it is generally not at all easy to prove that a particular expression enjoys this property. A good test case is the small region limit. This will be our concern in this work. Here we consider specifically the pseudotensor expressions. For a small region, one can expand the energy-momentum density in Riemann normal coordinate (RNC) about the origin:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta(x) &= \mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 + \partial_\mu \mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 x^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 x^\mu x^\nu + \dots \\ &= T_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 + \partial_\mu T_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 x^\mu + \dots + t_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 + \partial_\mu t_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 x^\mu + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu t_\alpha{}^\beta|_0 x^\mu x^\nu + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

By construction $t_\alpha^\beta|_0$ and $\partial_\mu t_\alpha^\beta|_0$ vanish. Consequently, for small x^μ inside of matter the T_α^β and $\partial_\mu T_\alpha^\beta$ terms dominate (this is a reflection of the equivalence principle). In vacuum regions all the T_α^β terms vanish, then the lowest order non-vanishing term is $\frac{1}{2}\partial_{\mu\nu}^2 t_\alpha^\beta|_0 x^\mu x^\nu$. This is the object of our concern in this work. It turns out that for all proposed pseudotensor and quasilocal energy-momentum expressions this fourth rank tensor is quadratic in the Riemann (equivalent in vacuum regions to the Weyl) tensor. That is why the quadratic curvature expressions become interesting and important (i.e., $\partial_{\mu\nu}^2 t_\alpha^\beta \simeq R_{\alpha\lambda\mu\sigma} R^{\beta\lambda}{}_\nu{}^\sigma$). Normally, the expansion of a pseudotensor expression up to second order can only be some linear combination of three tensors $\{B, S, K\}$ or $\{B, S, W\}$ [1] which are each certain quadratic expressions in the curvature.

In the small region vacuum limit, the quasilocal energy-momentum expression, which is future pointing and nonspacelike must be proportional to the Bel-Robinson ‘momentum’: $B_{\mu\lambda\xi\kappa} t^\lambda t^\xi t^\kappa$ (4.2.2 in [2]), where t is timelike unit vector. This is a strong test. In the past, B has been considered to be the only tensor which contributes positivity in small sphere limit. However, we recently proposed an alternative V (see (24)) which have the identical Bel-Robinson ‘momentum’ at the same limit. Unfortunately, confining a small sphere region, $\{B, V\}$ cannot be distinguishable which implies V is duplicated. Nevertheless, as the basic requirement for the quasilocal energy is small 2-surface, there is no restriction it must be a sphere. Examining the energy-momentum and angular momentum such as a small box (see Table 1), we find they have different values which clarifies $\{B, V\}$ are distincted.

2 Quadratic curvature tensors

Using Taylor series expansion, the metric tensor can be written as

$$g_{\alpha\beta}(x^\lambda) = g_{\alpha\beta}|_{x_0^\lambda} + \partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta}|_{x_0^\lambda} (x^\mu - x_0^\mu) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_{\mu\nu}^2 g_{\alpha\beta}|_{x_0^\lambda} (x^\mu - x_0^\mu)(x^\nu - x_0^\nu) + \dots \quad (4)$$

For simplicity, let $x_0^\lambda = 0$ and at the origin in RNC

$$g_{\alpha\beta}|_0 = \eta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \partial_\mu g_{\alpha\beta}|_0 = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$-3\partial_{\mu\nu}^2 g_{\alpha\beta}|_0 = R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu} + R_{\alpha\nu\beta\mu}, \quad -3\partial_\nu \Gamma^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta}|_0 = R^\mu{}_{\alpha\beta\nu} + R^\mu{}_{\beta\alpha\nu}. \quad (6)$$

Three basic tensors [3, 4] that commonly occurred in the pseudotensor are:

$$B_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv B_{(\alpha\beta\mu\nu)} := R_{\alpha\lambda\mu\sigma} R_\beta{}^\lambda{}_\nu{}^\sigma + R_{\alpha\lambda\nu\sigma} R_\beta{}^\lambda{}_\mu{}^\sigma - \frac{1}{8}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (7)$$

$$S_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv S_{(\alpha\beta)(\mu\nu)} \equiv S_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} := R_{\alpha\mu\lambda\sigma} R_\beta{}^\lambda{}_\nu{}^\sigma + R_{\alpha\nu\lambda\sigma} R_\beta{}^\lambda{}_\mu{}^\sigma + \frac{1}{4}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (8)$$

$$K_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv K_{(\alpha\beta)(\mu\nu)} \equiv K_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} := R_{\alpha\lambda\beta\sigma} R_\mu{}^\lambda{}_\nu{}^\sigma + R_{\alpha\lambda\sigma\beta} R_\nu{}^\lambda{}_\mu{}^\sigma - \frac{3}{8}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{R}^2 = R_{\rho\tau\xi\kappa} R^{\rho\tau\xi\kappa}$. Using the identity [5] in vacuum $R_{\alpha\lambda\sigma\tau} R_\beta{}^{\lambda\sigma\tau} = \frac{1}{4}g_{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{R}^2$, some properties of S and K are

$$S_{\alpha\mu\beta}{}^\mu \equiv 0 \equiv K_{\alpha\mu\beta}{}^\mu, \quad S_{\alpha\beta\mu}{}^\mu \equiv \frac{3}{2}g_{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{R}^2 \equiv -K_{\alpha\beta\mu}{}^\mu. \quad (10)$$

Unlike B , both S and K are neither totally symmetric nor totally traceless. For the non-completely symmetric property (i.e., $S_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \neq S_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}$ and $K_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \neq K_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}$ in general), one can explicitly verify this by using Petrov type D [6]. In particular

$$S_{0011} = -7(E_{11}^2 - H_{11}^2) \neq 2(E_{11}^2 - H_{11}^2) = S_{0101}, \quad (11)$$

$$K_{0011} = \frac{1}{2}(7E_{11}^2 - 9H_{11}^2) \neq -E_{11}^2 = K_{0101}, \quad (12)$$

where the evaluation has used the electric part E_{ab} and magnetic part H_{ab} , defined in terms of the Weyl tensor [7] as follows:

$$E_{ab} := C_{a0b0}, \quad H_{ab} := *C_{a0b0}, \quad (13)$$

where $*C_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}$ means its dual.

It may be worthwhile to emphasize that B has a very good analog with the electromagnetic stress tensor $\mathbf{T}^{\mu\nu}$. In Minkowski coordinates (t, x, y, z) :

$$\mathbf{T}^{00} = \frac{1}{2}(E_a E^a + B_a B^a), \quad (14)$$

$$\mathbf{T}^{0i} = \delta^{ij} \epsilon_{jab} E^a B^b = (\vec{E} \times \vec{B})^i, \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{T}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\delta^{ij} (E_a E^a + B_a B^a) - 2(E^i E^j + B^i B^j) \right]. \quad (16)$$

where $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ refer to the electric and magnetic field density. In order to appreciate the nice properties of B , we compare some components with S and K

$$B_{0000} = E_{ab} E^{ab} + H_{ab} H^{ab}, \quad (17)$$

$$S_{0000} = 2(E_{ab} E^{ab} - H_{ab} H^{ab}), \quad (18)$$

$$K_{0000} = -E_{ab} E^{ab} + 3H_{ab} H^{ab}. \quad (19)$$

Likewise for the momentum density (i.e., Poynting vector)

$$B_{000i} = 2\epsilon_{ijk} E^{jd} H^k_d, \quad S_{000i} = 0, \quad K_{000i} = 2\epsilon_{ijk} E^{jd} H^k_d. \quad (20)$$

Finally, the stress,

$$B_{00ij} = \delta_{ij} (E_{ab} E^{ab} + H_{ab} H^{ab}) - 2(E_{id} E_j^d + H_{id} H_j^d), \quad (21)$$

$$S_{00ij} = -2 \left[\delta_{ij} (E_{ab} E^{ab} - H_{ab} H^{ab}) + 2(E_{id} E_j^d - H_{id} H_j^d) \right], \quad (22)$$

$$K_{00ij} = \delta_{ij} (5E_{ab} E^{ab} - 3H_{ab} H^{ab}) - 4E_{id} E_j^d. \quad (23)$$

Observing that a linear combination between S and K has the same positive energy as B stands: $(B_{0000} - S_{0000} - K_{0000}) \equiv 0 \equiv (B_{00ij} - S_{00ij} - K_{00ij}) \delta^{ij}$. We define the alternative 4th rank tensor [1] as follows

$$V := S + K \equiv B + W, \quad (24)$$

where

$$W_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} := \frac{3}{2} S_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{8} (5g_{\alpha\beta} g_{\mu\nu} - g_{\alpha\mu} g_{\beta\nu} - g_{\alpha\nu} g_{\beta\mu}) \mathbf{R}^2. \quad (25)$$

Both $\{V, W\}$ have the following properties, let $X \in \{V, W\}$, then

$$X_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv X_{(\alpha\beta)(\mu\nu)} \equiv X_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}, \quad X_{\alpha\beta\mu}{}^\mu \equiv 0 \equiv X_{\alpha\mu\beta}{}^\mu, \quad (26)$$

It is known B has the dominant energy property [8, 9]: $B_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} w_1^\alpha w_2^\beta w_3^\mu w_4^\nu \geq 0$, where w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4 are any future-pointing causal vectors. While V only satisfies the weak energy condition and W fulfills none of them. Looking at (24), V contains more information than B , i.e., V has more non-trivial independent components. For W , it does not contribute energy-momentum in small sphere, but does contribute non-zero value at the other 2-surface such as ellipsoid or box (see Table 1). We also find that it is more convenience using $(B + W)$ to compare B instead of $(S + K)$.

In our work, we are mainly dealing with 4th rank quadratic curvature tensors. There are four independent tensors which form the basis of the space of tensors with appropriate symmetries [10], we may use

$$\tilde{B}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} := R_{\alpha\lambda\mu\sigma}R_{\beta}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu}{}^{\sigma} + R_{\alpha\lambda\nu\sigma}R_{\beta}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu}{}^{\sigma} \equiv B_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{8}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (27)$$

$$\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} := R_{\alpha\mu\lambda\sigma}R_{\beta\nu}{}^{\lambda\sigma} + R_{\alpha\nu\lambda\sigma}R_{\beta\mu}{}^{\lambda\sigma} \equiv S_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{4}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (28)$$

$$\tilde{K}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} := R_{\alpha\lambda\beta\sigma}R_{\mu}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\nu}{}^{\sigma} + R_{\alpha\lambda\beta\sigma}R_{\nu}{}^{\lambda}{}_{\mu}{}^{\sigma} \equiv K_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + \frac{3}{8}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad (29)$$

$$\tilde{T}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} := -\frac{1}{8}g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2. \quad (30)$$

They are designed to describe the gravitational energy expression based on the pseudotensor (see (33)) and are manifestly symmetric in the last two indices, i.e., $\tilde{M}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \tilde{M}_{\alpha\beta(\mu\nu)}$. Then $\tilde{M}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \tilde{M}_{(\alpha\beta)\mu\nu}$ and it also naturally turns out $\tilde{M}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \tilde{M}_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$. Although there exists some other tensors different from $\{\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{T}\}$ which have these symmetries, they are linear combinations of these four, e.g.,

$$\tilde{T}_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu} + \tilde{T}_{\alpha\nu\beta\mu} \equiv \tilde{B}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} - \tilde{K}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + 2\tilde{T}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}. \quad (31)$$

In addition, this identity gives another representation for the Bel-Robinson tensor:

$$B_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}S_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + K_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{8}(5g_{\alpha\beta}g_{\mu\nu} - g_{\alpha\mu}g_{\beta\nu} - g_{\alpha\nu}g_{\beta\mu})\mathbf{R}^2. \quad (32)$$

3 Energy-momentum tensors of B and V

3.1 Alternative gravitational energy-momentum tensor V

Let $x^\mu = (t, x, y, z)$ and using a RNC Taylor expansion around any point, consider all the possible combinations of the small region in vacuum, the total energy-momentum density pseudotensor is general expressed as

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta = \kappa^{-1}G_\alpha{}^\beta + (a_1\tilde{B}_\alpha{}^\beta{}_{\xi\kappa} + a_2\tilde{S}_\alpha{}^\beta{}_{\xi\kappa} + a_3\tilde{K}_\alpha{}^\beta{}_{\xi\kappa} + a_4\tilde{T}_\alpha{}^\beta{}_{\xi\kappa})x^\xi x^\kappa + \mathcal{O}(\text{Ricci}, x) + \mathcal{O}(x^3), \quad (33)$$

where a_1 to a_4 are constants. Since our concern is the vacuum case, so $G_{\alpha\beta} = 0 = T_{\alpha\beta}$. Then the first order linear in Ricci terms $\mathcal{O}(\text{Ricci}, x)$ vanish. The lowest order non-vanishing term is of second order, compared to this in the small region limit we ignore the third order terms $\mathcal{O}(x^3)$. It should be noted that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta$ in (33) is a pseudotensor, but in the Taylor expansion on the right hand side the coefficients of the various powers of x are tensors. As argued in [10], $\partial_{\mu\nu}^2\mathcal{T}_\alpha{}^\beta(0)$ must be some linear combination of 4 tensors, here we use $\{\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{T}\}$. From now on, the second order term will be kept but the others are dropped. There are two physical conditions which can constrain the unlimited combinations between $\{\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{T}\}$: Energy-momentum conservation and positive gravitational energy, both considered in the small region vacuum limit.

First condition: energy-momentum conservation. Consider (33) in vacuum

$$0 = \partial_\beta t_\alpha{}^\beta = \frac{1}{4}(a_1 - 2a_2 + 3a_3 - a_4)g_{\alpha\beta}x^\beta\mathbf{R}^2. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, the constraint for the conservation of the energy-momentum density is

$$a_4 = a_1 - 2a_2 + 3a_3. \quad (35)$$

Although there exists infinite number of combinations which fulfill the above constraint, it has removed one degree of freedom. As each single tensor from $\{\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{T}\}$ cannot satisfy the conservation requirement, but a linear combination of them can. One can simplify the situation by eliminating $\tilde{T}$ which is absorbed by $\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}$ or $\tilde{K}$. Rewrite (33) in vacuum

$$\begin{aligned} 2\kappa t_{\alpha\beta} &= \left[a_1(\tilde{B}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + \tilde{T}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa}) + a_2(\tilde{S}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} - 2\tilde{T}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa}) + a_3(\tilde{K}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + 3\tilde{T}_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa}) \right] x^\xi x^\kappa \\ &= (a_1 B_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + a_2 S_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + a_3 K_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa}) x^\xi x^\kappa \\ &= [(a_1 + a_3) B_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + (a_2 - a_3) S_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa} + a_3 W_{\alpha\beta\xi\kappa}] x^\xi x^\kappa. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

When one considers all the possible expressions for the pseudotensors (some of which explicitly included the flat metric), there indeed does appear linear combinations of these three tensors [11, 12]. Explicitly, $\{B, S, K\}$ or $\{B, S, W\}$. We prefer the latter because $W \equiv V - B$ which does not contribute 4-momentum in small sphere region, then B is preserved.

Second condition: non-negative gravitational energy in small region, i.e., any 2-surface. For example, we use sphere. For any quantity at $t = t_0$ as the limiting value for radius r where $r^2 := x^2 + y^2 + z^2$. The 4-momentum at time $t = 0$ is

$$2\kappa P_\mu = \int t^\rho{}_{\mu\xi\kappa} x^\xi x^\kappa d\Sigma_\rho = t^0{}_{\mu ij} \int x^i x^j d^3x = t^0{}_{\mu ij} \delta^{ij} \frac{4\pi r^5}{15}, \quad (37)$$

where $\int x^i x^j d^3x = 4\pi r^5/15$ when $i = j$, otherwise zero in spherical coordinate. Thus, (36) can be rewritten as

$$P_\mu = (-E, \vec{P}) = -\frac{r^5}{60G} [(a_1 + a_3) B_{\mu 0ij} + (a_2 - a_3) S_{\mu 0ij}] \delta^{ij}, \quad (38)$$

where $W_{\mu 0ij} \delta^{ij} \equiv 0$. The energy-momentum values associated with $\{B, S\}$ are

$$B_{\mu 0ij} \delta^{ij} = (E_{ab}^2 + H_{ab}^2, 2\epsilon_{cab} E^{ad} H^b{}_d), \quad S_{\mu 0ij} \delta^{ij} = -10(E_{ab}^2 - H_{ab}^2, 0). \quad (39)$$

Here we emphasize that the 4-momentum of B is inside the light cone, $-P_0 \geq |\vec{P}| \geq 0$. Observing (38), basically we are considering the positive energy within a small sphere, B already satisfies this condition and the remaining job is to find $\{a_2, a_3\}$. Equation (39) shows that $S_{\mu 0ij} \delta^{ij}$ cannot ensure positivity, since we should allow for any magnitude of $|E_{ab}|$ and $|H_{ab}|$. The only possibility for (38) to guarantee positivity is when $a_1 + a_3 \geq 10|a_2 - a_3|$. However, if we insist the Bel-Robinson ‘momentum’, we only have one choice $a_2 = a_3$.

3.2 Computing energy-momentum and angular momentum

Some pseudotensors [1] give the result as a linear combination of $\{B, V\}$: Papapetrou, $2\kappa P^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{9}(4B^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\xi\kappa} - V^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\xi\kappa}) x^\xi x^\kappa$. The energy using (37) is

$$P_0 = -\frac{r^5}{540G} (4B_{00ij} - V_{00ij}) \delta^{ij} = -\frac{r^5}{180G} B_{00ij} \delta^{ij}, \quad (40)$$

where $(B_{00ij} - V_{00ij}) \delta^{ij} \equiv 0$. Before we proceed, one might question that perhaps $\{B, V\}$ are equivalent. Does V duplicate? Here we claim they are different since $B_{00ij} \neq V_{00ij}$ in general. Elementary, they are constructed from different quadratic curvatures: $B = \tilde{B} + \tilde{T}$ and $V = \tilde{S} + \tilde{K} + \tilde{T}$. In addition, as a double check, we find $\{B, V\}$ have different components which is shown in section 3.3.

Perfect-sphere	$P_\mu = \frac{4\pi}{15} t^0_{\mu ij} \delta^{ij} a^5, \quad r \in [0, a], \quad \theta \in [0, \pi], \quad \phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ $J^{0m} = (0, 0, 0), \quad (J^{12}, J^{13}, J^{23}) = (0, 0, 0)$
Ellipsoid	$P_\mu = \frac{4\pi}{15} (t^0_{\mu 11} a^2 + t^0_{\mu 22} b^2 + t^0_{\mu 33} c^2) abc, \quad x \in [-a, a], \quad y \in [-b, b], \quad z \in [-c, c]$ $J^{0m} = (0, 0, 0), \quad (J^{12}, J^{13}, J^{23}) = (0, 0, 0)$
Hemi-sphere	$P_\mu = \frac{2\pi}{15} t^0_{\mu ij} \delta^{ij} a^5, \quad r \in [0, a], \quad \theta \in [0, \pi/2], \quad \phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ $J^{0m} = \frac{\pi}{24} (2t^0_{013}, 2t^0_{023}, t^0_{0ij} \delta^{ij} + t^0_{033}) r^6$ $J^{12} = \frac{\pi}{12} (t^1_{023} - t^2_{013}) r^6, \quad J^{13} = \frac{\pi}{24} (t^1_{0ij} \delta^{ij} + t^1_{033} - 2t^3_{013}) r^6,$ $J^{23} = \frac{\pi}{24} (t^2_{0ij} \delta^{ij} + t^2_{033} - 2t^3_{023}) r^6$
Box	$P_\mu = \frac{1}{12} (t^0_{\mu 11} a^2 + t^0_{\mu 22} b^2 + t^0_{\mu 33} c^2) abc, \quad x \in [-\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}], \quad y \in [-\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2}], \quad z \in [-\frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2}]$ $J^{0m} = (0, 0, 0), \quad (J^{12}, J^{13}, J^{23}) = (0, 0, 0)$
Cylinder	$P_\mu = \frac{\pi}{4} t^0_{\mu ij} \delta^{ij} a^4 h + \frac{\pi}{12} t^0_{\mu 33} (h^2 - 3a^2) a^2 h, \quad \rho \in [0, a], \quad \varphi \in [0, 2\pi], \quad z \in [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]$ $J^{0m} = (0, 0, 0), \quad (J^{12}, J^{13}, J^{23}) = (0, 0, 0)$
Half-cylinder	$P_\mu = \frac{\pi}{8} t^0_{\mu ij} \delta^{ij} a^4 h + \frac{\pi}{24} t^0_{\mu 33} (h^2 - 3a^2) a^2 h, \quad \rho \in [0, a], \quad \varphi \in [0, \pi], \quad z \in [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]$ $J^{01} = \frac{4}{15} t^0_{012} a^5 h, \quad J^{02} = \frac{1}{18} t^0_{033} a^3 h^3 + \frac{2}{15} (t^0_{011} + 2t^0_{022}) a^5 h, \quad J^{03} = \frac{1}{9} t^0_{023} a^3 h^3$ $J^{12} = \frac{1}{18} t^1_{033} a^3 h^3 + \frac{2}{15} (t^1_{011} + 2t^1_{022} - 2t^2_{012}) a^5 h, \quad J^{13} = \frac{1}{9} t^1_{023} a^3 h^3 - \frac{4}{15} t^3_{012} a^5 h$ $J^{23} = \frac{1}{18} (2t^2_{023} - t^3_{033}) a^3 h^3 - \frac{2}{15} (t^3_{011} + 2t^3_{022}) a^5 h$

Table 1: Energy-momentum and angular momentum in different small regions

Usually, the gravitational energy-momentum is integrating in a sphere or ellipsoid [13, 14, 15, 16]. For angular momentum [3], it is defined as

$$J^{\mu\nu} := \int (x^\mu t^{\nu 0}_{\xi\kappa} - x^\nu t^{\mu 0}_{\xi\kappa}) x^\xi x^\kappa d^3x. \quad (41)$$

We evaluated the energy-momentum and angular momentum in different 2-surfaces which is shown in Table 1. The 4-momentum for $\{B, V\}$ can have different values, e.g., box with different lengths.

Fulfilling the Bel-Robinson ‘momentum’ requirement using either $\{B, V\}$ in small regions: box allows $a = b = c$, cylinder and half-cylinder when $h^2 = 3a^2$. We observe that there is no angular momentum for perfect sphere, ellipsoid, box or cylinder. The reason is not the integrand $t^0_{\mu ij} x^k x^i x^j = 0$, but the integral $\int t^0_{\mu ij} x^k x^i x^j d^3x \equiv 0$. Conversely, both hemi-sphere and half cylinder have non-vanishing angular momentum since $\int t^0_{\mu ij} x^k x^i x^j d^3x \neq 0$. Moreover, we remark for hemi-sphere, if we substitute B , $J^{12} = \frac{\pi}{12} (B_{0123} - B_{0213}) r^6 = 0$. However, if substitute V , $J^{12} = \frac{\pi}{12} (V_{0123} - V_{0213}) r^6 \neq 0$ in general. Thus, the differences between $\{B, V\}$ becomes sharp in this case.

3.3 Counting the independent components of $\{B, V, W\}$

Here we count the components of $\{B, V, W\}$. Basically, these three tensors are fourth rank, in principle they could have 256 components. However, after considering the symmetry properties, they only have a relatively small number of independent components. Counting B has been done, here we claim there is no common term between B and W , i.e., $\{B\} \cap \{W\} = \{\emptyset\}$. We verify this statement as follows:

First, we count the independent components of B . In principle, B is completely symmetric, by explicit examination it reduces to 35 components. There is a formula that directly gives this number. A k th rank totally symmetric tensor in n dimensional space has C_k^{n+k-1} components. For our case $C_4^{4+4-1} = 35$. Since B is completely trace free, there are 10 additional constraints which reduce the number of components. Therefore, we have left only 25 components for B (another argument see [6]).

Second, we count V . V does not have the completely symmetric property, but fulfill some certain symmetries $V_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} \equiv V_{(\alpha\beta)(\mu\nu)} \equiv V_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ as mentioned in (26). In principle, this reduces V to 55 components. However, when we consider the totally

traceless, the two extra constraints indicated in (26): $V^\alpha_{\alpha\mu\nu} \equiv 0 \equiv V^\alpha_{\mu\alpha\nu}$. Consequently we have $55 - 10 - 10 = 35$ components for V .

Finally, we count W . Note that V and W are similar. In principle, refer to (26), there should thus be at most 35 components. However, one must also consider the extra constraint $W_{\alpha(\beta\mu\nu)} \equiv 0$. This gives 25 additional independent constraints. Hence we find $35 - 25 = 10$ components for W .

3.4 Physical meaning of the completely traceless property

For the quasilocal small region energy-momentum expressions, there are four fundamental quadratic in Weyl curvature tensors. We know that $\tilde{M}_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu} = \tilde{M}_{(\alpha\beta)(\mu\nu)} = \tilde{M}_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ for all $\tilde{M} \in \{\tilde{B}, \tilde{S}, \tilde{K}, \tilde{T}\}$. In order to check the completely trace free property of the linear combinations of these four, let

$$A := a_1\tilde{B} + a_2\tilde{S} + a_3\tilde{K} + a_4\tilde{T}. \quad (42)$$

Consider all the combinations, there are two distinct traces because the symmetry:

$$8A^\alpha_{\mu\alpha\nu} \equiv (a_1 - 2a_2 + 3a_3 - a_4)g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2, \quad 2A^\alpha_{\alpha\mu\nu} \equiv (a_1 + a_2 - a_4)g_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{R}^2. \quad (43)$$

For the completely traceless, the two traces in (43) have to vanish simultaneously

$$0 = a_1 - 2a_2 + 3a_3 - a_4, \quad (44)$$

$$0 = a_1 + a_2 - a_4. \quad (45)$$

Notice that (44) is the same as (35) which indicates one of the mathematical traceless conditions turns out to be one of the physical criteria. Solving (44) and (45), we obtain $a_2 = a_3$ and this is the 4-momentum requirement denoted in (38). They are 1-1 corresponding. From these two results, the completely traceless is not just a mathematical property, but covering some physical property.

4 Conclusion

Describing the positive gravitational energy, the Bel-Robinson tensor is the best and perhaps people may think it is the only one. We recently proposed an alternative V in such a way that it shares the same 4-momentum as B does in small sphere limit. But, can we separate $\{B, V\}$ via the different energy value beside this particular sphere region? Yes, after examining the value such as ellipsoid, box and cylinder, we conclude that $\{B, V\}$ are distinct. In addition, as a double check, we count the independent components of $\{B, V\}$ and indeed they are different. Finally, we discover a necessary and sufficient conditions of $\{B, V\}$: completely trace free and conservation of future pointing non-spacelike Bel-Robinson ‘momentum’.

References

- [1] So L L 2009 *Class. and Quantum Grav.* **26** 185004
- [2] Szabados L B 2009 *Living Rev. Relativity* **12** 4
- [3] Misner C W, Thorne K S and Wheeler J A 1973 *Gravitation* (San Francisco, CA: Freeman)
- [4] So L L 2007 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **16** 875

- [5] Yefremov A P 1975 *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B6** 667
- [6] Gomez-Lobo A G P 2008 *Class. Quantum. Grav.* **25** 015006
- [7] Carmeli M “*Classical Fields General relativity and Gauge Theory*” (John Wiley & Sons 1982)
- [8] Penrose R and Rindler W 1984 *Spinors and spacetime* (Cambridge U.P., Cambridge) Vol. 1
- [9] Senovilla J M M 2000 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17** 2799
- [10] Deser S, Franklin J S and Seminaea D 1999 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **16** 2815
- [11] So L L and Nester J M 2009 *Class. and Quantum Grav.* **26** 085004
- [12] So L L and Nester J M 2009 *Phys. Rev. D* **79** 084028
- [13] Garecki J 1973 *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B4** 347
- [14] Horowitz G T and Schmidt B G 1982 *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **381** 215
- [15] Kelly R M, Tod K P and Woodhouse N M 1986 *Class. Quantum. Grav.* **3** 1151
- [16] Bergqvist G 1998 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **15** 1535